



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,257	04/10/2004	Robin S. Gray		2705

7590 07/09/2008
ROBIN S. GRAY
3538 SPLIT RAIL LANE
ELLCOTT CITY, MD 21042

EXAMINER

MAHAFKEY, KELLY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1794

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/09/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/822,257	GRAY, ROBIN S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kelly Mahafkey	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Amendments made 3/28/08 have been entered.

Claims 21-56 remain pending.

Claim Objections

The objections to claims 36-56 have been withdrawn in light of applicant's amendments made 3/28/08.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 37 has been withdrawn in light of applicant's amendments made 3/28/08.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 23, 30, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Durst (US 3615597). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Luck (US 3966993). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claims 21, 23-27, 30, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Forkner (US 4068007). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claims 30, 31, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bogdan (US 5855939). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claims 21, 22, 30, 41, 42, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alden (US 5894028). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 28, 29, 32-34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Durst (US 3615597). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claims 38, 39, 46, 48-50 and 52-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forkner (US 4068007). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forkner (US 4068007) in view of Jordan (US 3848757). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claims 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogdan (US 5855939). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogdan (US 5855939) in view of Luck (US 3966993). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Claims 37 and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alden (US 5894028). The references and rejection are incorporated herein and as cited in the office action mailed September 26, 2007.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues repeatedly that the limitation of “the condiment sheet comprising a single condiment sheet, a face-fused condiment sheet, a side fused condiment sheet, a face fused side fused condiment sheet, a chopped condiment sheet, a woven condiment sheet, and combinations thereof” was not addressed in the office action. Applicant’s arguments are not convincing as the Examiner believed that it was clear from the office action that when the method of making the sheets was discussed, it would be common sense what type of sheet was formed as would inherently result from the method. For example, the office action, page 4 states, “Forkner teaches that the condiment slice can be formed from an aggregate of different materials in a mold, from rolling or extruding and cutting, or from adhering two condiment slices together.” Thus it would be inherent that a fused condiment sheet would be formed. The only options for fusing the sheet would be a face fuse, side fuse, or side face fuse. Thus, it would be obvious that the teachings of the reference as cited in the office action teach of the claimed limitations, a fused condiment sheet which was either face fused, side fused, or face side fused. Applicant is reminded that although every claimed limitation need be addressed, every claim number need not be recited in the body of the rejection. Furthermore, applicant is reminded that the references and the rejection need not contain identical language to the claim language. For example, sauce is a type of condiment, a reference inherently teaches of condiments by teaching of a sauce; a reference that teaches of a sauce need not state the term “condiment” in order to teach of a condiment.

Applicant argues repeatedly that the references of record teach of strips and wafers, not sheets, and that there is a difference between the terms. Applicant, however, cites no differences to distinguish between a “sheet” and a “slice” and “a wafer”. It is unclear as to how the terms are structurally different. Applicant further states that the examiner uses alternative meanings and interprets the references of record in multiple ways. For the 102 rejections, the examiner has relied only upon the teachings of the reference, inherent and explicit, as taught by the references. Furthermore, as stated above, there is no clear difference between the recited terms

Art Unit: 1794

and thus it is further unclear as to how the references were interpreted with multiple meanings.

Applicant argues that Durst does not teach of forming condiment slices from a condiment sheet and of removing the condiment pieces from the mold. As stated in the office action, in example 5, Durst teaches of molding condiment material, thus forming a condiment sheet. In example 5, Durst teaches that the condiment sheet is cut to form condiment strips. In example 5, Durst discusses the taste of the condiment sheets, and thus Durst inherently teaches that the condiment pieces are removed from the mold.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., removing a frozen product from a mold prior to slicing) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that Forkner does not teach of binding two condiment pieces together with a condiment sheet as a bonding layer, heating to produce said binding, and that a condiment sheet is only a sheet and cannot act as a binder. Applicant's argument is not convincing, applicant is encourage to reread the office action, specifically page 4, in which it states, "Forkner teaches that two condiment sheets can be bound together with another condiment sheet as a bonding layer (Column 4 lines 26-50 and Figure 5)." Forkner Column 4 lines 26-50 states, "After the wafers have been assembled within the main body of the container in the manner shown in FIG. 3 and the top applied, the incompletely sealed container is placed in an oven whereby the wafers are heated to soften the same, as for example, to a temperature within the range of 120 to 150F. The assembly is then introduced into a chamber and subjected to a partial vacuum of the order of 28 to 29 inches mercury column. This causes the desired expansion of the wafers, the degree of expansion being controlled whereby the side faces of each wafer comes into juxtaposition with, and in this instance, in direct contact with the faces of an adjacent wafer, thus eliminating spaces between the wafers to form a tight or compacted pack and causing the wafers to be lightly bonded together." Both

Art Unit: 1794

Figures 3 and 5 show more than three wafers adjacent to one another. Thus, as stated in the office action, Forkner teaches of binding by heated face fusing three condiment pieces together wherein the middle condiment section bonds or holds together the first and third condiment piece. As stated above, applicant is reminded that the references and the rejection need not contain identical language to the claim language to teach of the claimed limitations. Forkners teaching of a layer which holds two components together need not state the term “binder” in order to teach of a binder. As a binder is defined as a thing that binds, the reference teaches of a binder by teaching of a sheet component which functions to hold two sheets together and thus the middle sheet is by definition a binder, the reference need not label the component “binder” in order to teach of a binder.

Applicant argues that Bogdan does not teach of a mold with designs for forming borders, words, or designs in the condiment structure, and that the examiner draws this inappropriate conclusion. Applicant’s argument is not convincing as Bogden teaches of condiment slices which are formed by molding in the shape of comic characters. In order for the condiment to be formed in the shape of a comic character by molding, as taught by Bogdan, the mold would have to have designs for forming borders and/or designs. This would be inherent. It is unclear as to how else a condiment slice in the shape of a comic character formed by molding could be formed.

Applicant argues that Bogdan does not teach of two molds in which the molded materials are joined together. Applicant is referred to Column 2 lines 14-30.

Applicant argues that Alden does not teach of a condiment strip or the methods of making a condiment sheet. Applicant’s argument is not convincing as Alden teaches of forming a sheet of pizza sauce, cheese, and other pizza toppings. A condiment is defined as “something used to give special flavor to a food”, thus pizza sauce and other pizza toppings, such as cheese, are condiments, and thus Alden teaches of a condiment sheet. As stated above, applicant is reminded that the references and the rejection need not contain identical language to the claim language to teach of the claimed limitations. Specifically regarding applicant’s arguments that Alden does not teach of making a condiment sheet, applicant’s arguments is based on the argument

Art Unit: 1794

that pizza sauce is not a condiment. As applicant's argument that pizza sauce is not a condiment is not convincing, neither is applicant's argument that Alden does not teach of forming a condiment slice.

Applicant argues that Alden does not teach of joining surfaces of the condiment sections by fusing and or by weaving. Applicant is referred to Column 3 lines 15-16 and Column 3 line 67 through Column 4 line 51 of Alden. Applicant further argues that Alden teaches of intermingling which is not interweaving. Interweaving is defined as "to become woven together, interlaced, or intermingled", thus Alden teaches of interweaving as the term is defined. At the present time no limitations exist to distinguish the two terms.

Applicant argues that bulk materials as taught by Alden cannot function as condiment strips or slices. Applicant's argument is not convincing as Alden teaches of forming a sheet of pizza sauce, cheese, and other pizza toppings. A condiment is defined as "something used to give special flavor to a food", pizza sauce and other pizza toppings, such as cheese, are condiments, and this Alden teaches of a condiments. Furthermore, as stated above, there are no structural limitations to define a strip or a strand and Alden teaches of cutting pepperoni logs and whole vegetables into pieces, thus Alden teaches of cutting condiment strips.

Applicant argues that the desired size of a condiment piece has nothing to do with how a condiment piece is cut. It is unclear as to how applicant's argument makes common sense and as to how the two cannot be connected. Applicant's argument is not convincing as the desired size of a food directly dictates the manner in which the food is cut, or even if it is cut at all.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to provide a cutting tool for the condiment piece as taught by Durst since Durst teaches of shaping by molding. Applicant's argument is not convincing as Durst teaches of cutting the molded condiment piece into smaller pieces, and thus some type of cutting device would be required to complete the process of forming a condiment section as taught by Durst (see Example 5). Furthermore, applicant argues that the condiment as taught by Durst must be cut within a mold, it is unclear as to where applicant found this teaching in

Art Unit: 1794

Durst. Furthermore, it is unclear as to why the condiment pieces could not be cut while in the mold.

Applicant argues that it is unclear how the teachings of Forkner in combination with an obvious statement for making a batch process continuous meets the limitations of claim 38. Applicant is referred to their claims, specifically claim 38 in which it recites "A continuous method for forming condiment slices: a) feeding continuous condiment sheets from continuous molding process to a dividing station; b) dividing said condiment sheets into continuous strips; c) mating said continuous condiment strips; d) heating said mating surfaces of said continuous condiment strips to a flow point; f) abutting the heated mating surfaces of the continuous condiment strips to cause fusion of the surfaces and form a continuous fused combination condiment sheet; g) dividing said continuous fused combination condiment strip sheet to form condiment slices."

Applicant is referred to Forkner, Column 3 lines 37-49, in which Forkner teaches a method for forming condiment slices: a) feeding condiment sheets to a dividing station; b) dividing said condiment sheets, i.e. condiment pieces; c) mating condiment strips, i.e. molding condiment pieces; d) heating said mating surfaces of the condiment strips to a flow point; f) abutting the heated mating surfaces of the continuous condiment strips to cause fusion of the surfaces and form a continuous fused combination condiment sheet; g) dividing said continuous fused combination condiment strip sheet to form condiment slices. Forkner teaches of the claimed process with the exception of the continuousness. Thus, Forkner's teaches of the claimed method and the obviousness statement for using a continuous process meet the claimed limitations.

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to use a cutting tool in the method as taught by Forkner since Forkner teaches of shaping by molding. Applicant's argument is not convincing as Forkner teaches that the molded condiment pieces can be removed from the mold attached to one another and pulled apart (Example 1) and as stated in the rejection, one would have been motivated to use a cutting device to assist with separating the condiment pieces. Furthermore, it was known to cut slices in molding devices and a molding device is not motivation not to cut a piece of material from the molded material.

Art Unit: 1794

Applicant argues Forkner does not teach of a vacuum apparatus as recited in claim 47. Examiner agrees with applicant, as claim 47 is rejected by the combination of Forkner and Jordan, and Jordan teaches of a vacuum apparatus for slices. It is noted that claim 47 was rejected twice in the office action, both over Forkner alone and over Forkner in view of Jordan. In the rejection over Forkner alone it was a type to include claim 47.

Applicant argues that no where in the rejection is an obvious statement regarding the use of a hopper apparatus. Applicant is again referred to the office action, page 7.

Applicant argues that the mold is conveyed beneath the ejection nozzle and that the examiner does not address this claimed limitation. Applicant's argument is not convincing as the office action states motivation for making a continuous conveyed process and as it would be inherent that the mold be below the mold injection nozzle.

Applicant argues that Forkner does not teach of extruded material and that the examiner states that Forkner does and does not teach of extruded material. It is noted that the office action, page 6 states, "Forkner, however is silent to... the extruded material as placed in a cutting or slice molding device as recited in claim 56". The office action does not state that Forkner "does not teach of an extruded material." Applicant has taken the words of the office action out of context, the examiner states, Forkner, however is silent to... the extruded material as placed in a cutting or slice molding device." Furthermore, applicant is referred to Forkner, Column 3 lines 50-60, as cited in the office action, which teaches of extrusion, i.e. the act of shaping through a die.

Applicant is reminded that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Applicant argues that the statement that injection nozzles were known in confections, such as injecting jelly into a doughnut is not applicable to the present invention. Applicant's argument is not convincing as the jelly doughnut example was

Art Unit: 1794

simply given to demonstrate that injection filling and molding is well known and commonly used in the food art.

Applicant argues that Bogdan does not teach of a large scale continuous process and thus one would not have been motivated to use an injection apparatus. Applicant's argument is not convincing, applicant is referred to the office action, pages 8-9, which states continuous process where known and it would have been obvious to use an injection apparatus in order to have a continuous process which was more efficient.

Applicant argues that Bogdan does not teach the claimed steps as recited in claim 40. Applicant is reminded that the rejection was made over a combination of references, i.e. over Bogdan and Luck, and not over Bogdan alone.

Applicant argues that Luck never recites the terms "strip" and "condiment structure", but instead discusses a sauce. As stated above, applicant is reminded that the references and the rejection need not contain identical language to the claim language to teach of the claimed limitations. Luck teaches of a sauce which is slice frozen in form is a teaching of a strip condiment structure.

Applicant argues that since Bogdan and Luck teach of preferred embodiments in which a batch process is used one would not have been motivated to use a continuous embodiment. Applicant's arguments are not convincing as it was well known to convert batch processes into continuous processes and to do so would be within the ordinary ingenuity of one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant is further referred to the MPEP 2144.04, in which it states "providing an automatic or mechanical means to replace manual activity which accomplish the same result is not sufficient to distinguish over prior art".

Applicant argues that Bogdan and Luck teach of diverging packaging requirements and different types of foods, and thus cannot be combined. First it is noted that there are not packaging requirements in the recited claim. Furthermore, Applicant is reminded that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references

Art Unit: 1794

would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Applicant argues that the claim limitation of “extruding a plurality of continuous condiment sections” was not addressed in the office action. Applicant is referred to the office action pages 9-10 which address these limitations of claim 40.

Applicant argues that Bogdan teaches of molding a liquid material which cannot be extruded and thus one would not have been motivated to extrude. Applicant's argument is not convincing both molding and extrusion were well known shaping techniques and it would be within the ordinary ingenuity of one of ordinary skill in the art to move from one method to another. To slightly modify the process and the molding composition would be routine and would not impart a patentable distinction to the claims. Further, applicant is referred to Luck, column 4 lines 16-24, which teaches that either extrusion or molding can be utilized for shaping.

Applicant argues that Bogdan teaches of a combination of food slices but not a loaf of food slices. A loaf is defined as a shaped or molded food mass, thus it is unclear as to how the layered molded food slices as taught by Bogdan are not loaves.

Applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to introduce a cutting step into the method of Bogdan or Luck because Bogdan teaches of molding the materials to standard sandwich size and Luck does not teach of a sauce bar which requires cutting. Applicant's argument is not convincing as it would be obvious to cut the material if the consumer desired half a sandwich condiment piece.

In response to applicant's argument that Alden does not teach of cutting as recited in claims 43 and 44, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, cutting pizza was well known and the claim limitations have been rejected over the knowledge available to one of ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of the reference.

Art Unit: 1794

Applicant is referred to the previous office action, pages 10-11. Applicant further argues that it would not be obvious to cut the pizza disk as taught by Alden. This is not convincing as once the pizza disk was applied to a pizza base and a consumer intended to eat the pizza, it would have been obvious to cut the pizza, including the cutting of the pizza disk.

Applicant argues that Alden does not teach of the imitations as recited in claim 37. Applicant is referred to the office action pages 10-11 which address the limitations of claim 37. Applicant is further reminded that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant argues that Alden does not teach of weaving. Weaving is defined as for form by combining various elements as a whole. As Alden teaches of combining various condiments as a whole onto a frozen pizza disk, Alden teaches of a woven condiment sheet.

Applicant argues that it is unclear as to what pizza has to do with the claimed invention. As stated herein and as stated in the previous office action, pizza sauce is a condiment and as applicant's claims recite condiments, pizza is encompassed by the instantly claimed invention. If applicant feels that the claims do not accurately reflect the invention, applicant is encouraged to add limitations to the claims which do reflect the instant invention.

Applicant argues that the Examiner does not address the limitations of the edge sealer as recited in claim 45. Applicant is referred to the previous office action, pages 11-12.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 1794

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelly Mahafkey whose telephone number is (571) 272-2739. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571) 272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lien Tran/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794

/Kelly Mahafkey/
Examiner
Art Unit 1794